arXiv:1610.01386v1 [math.AP] 5 Oct 2016

Existence of discretely self-similar solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations for initial value in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$

Dongho Chae* and Jörg Wolf †

∗Department of Mathematics
Chung-Ang University
Seoul 156-756, Republic of Korea
e-mail: dchae@cau.ac.kr
and
†Department of Mathematics
Humboldt University Berlin
Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany
e-mail: jwolf@math.hu-berlin.de

Abstract

We prove the existence of a forward discretely self-similar solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations in $\mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, +\infty)$ for a discretely self-similar initial velocity belonging to $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

AMS Subject Classification Number: 76B03, 35Q31
keywords: Navier-Stokes equations, existence, discretely self-similar solutions

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the existence of forward discretely self-similar (DSS) solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations in $Q = \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0, +\infty)$

$$\nabla \cdot u = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla)u - \Delta u = -\nabla \pi, \tag{1.2}$$

with the initial condition

$$u = u_0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Here $u(x,t) = (u_1(x,t), u_2(x,t), u_3(x,t))$ denotes the velocity of the fluid, and $u_0(x) = (u_{0,1}(x), u_{0,2}(x), u_{0,3}(x))$, while π stands for the pressure. In case $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with

$\nabla \cdot u_0 = 0$ in the sense of distributions the global in time existence of weak solutions to (1.1)–(1.3) , which satisfy the global energy inequality for almost all $t \in (0, +\infty)$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \int_0^t \|\nabla u(s)\|_2^2 ds \le \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|_2^2 \tag{1.4}$$

has been proved by Leray [8]. On the other hand, the important questions of regularity and uniqueness of solutions to (1.1)–(1.3) are still open. The first significant results in this direction have been established by Scheffer [9] and later by Caffarelli, Kohn, Nirenberg [2] for solutions (u, π) that also satisfy the following local energy inequality for almost all $t \in (0, +\infty)$ and for all nonnegative $\phi \in C_c^\infty(Q)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u(t)|^2 \phi(x,t) dx + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 \phi dx ds \\ &\qquad \le \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u|^2 \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + \Delta\Big)\phi dx ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (|u|^2 + 2\pi) u \cdot \nabla \phi dx ds. \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

On the other hand, the space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ excludes homogenous spaces of degree -1 belonging to the scaling invariant class. In fact we observe that $u_\lambda(x,t) = \lambda u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t)$ solves the Navier-Stokes equations with initial velocity $u_{0,\lambda}(x) = \lambda u_0(\lambda x)$, for any $\lambda > 0$. This suggests to study of the Navier-Stokes system for initial velocities in a homogenous space X of degree -1, which means that $\|v\|_X = \|v_\lambda\|_X$ for all $v \in X$. Koch and Tataru proved in [6] that $X = BMO^{-1}$ is the largest possible space with scaling invariant norm which guarantees well-posedness under smallness condition. On the contrary, for self-similar (SS) initial data fulfilling $u_{0,\lambda} = u$ for all $\lambda > 0$ a natural space seems to be $X = L^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. This space is embedded into the space $L^2_{uloc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, which contains uniformly local square integrable functions. Obviously, possible solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations with $u_0 \in L^2_{uloc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ do not satisfy the global energy equality, rather the local energy inequality in the sense of Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg. Such solutions are called local Leray solutions. The existence of global in time local Leray solutions has been proved by Lemarièe-Rieusset in [7] (see also in [5] for more details). This concept has been used by Bradshaw and Tsai [1] for the construction of a discretely self-similar (λ-DSS, $\lambda > 1$) local Leray solution for a λ-DSS initial velocity $u_0 \in L^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. This result generalizes the previous results of Jia and Šverák [4] concerning the existence of SS local Leray solution, and the result by Tsai in [10], which proves the existence of a λ-DSS Leray solution for λ near 1. However, for the λ-DSS initial data it would be more natural to assume $u_0 \in L^2_{uloc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ instead $L^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. In general, such initial value does not belong to $L^2_{uloc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and therefore it does not belong to the Morrey class $M^{2,1}$, rather to the weighted space $L^2_k(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of all $v \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\frac{v}{(1+|x|^k)} \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ for all $\frac{1}{2} < k < +\infty$.

Since the authors in [1] work on the existence of periodic solutions to the time dependent Leray equation a certain spatial decay is necessary which can be ensured for initial data in $L^{3,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. On the other hand, applying the local L^2 theory it would be

more natural to assume $u_0 \in L^2(B_\lambda \setminus B_1)$ only. As explained in [1] their method even breaks down for initial data in the Morrey class $M^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, which is a much smaller subspace of $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. By using an entirely different method we are able to construct a global weak solutions for such DSS initial data.

In the present paper we introduce a new notion of a local Leray solution satisfying a local energy inequality with projected pressure. To the end, we provide the notations of function spaces which will be use in the sequel. By $L^s(G), 1 \le s \le \infty$ we denote the usual Lebesgue spaces. The usual Sobolev spaces are denoted by $W^{k,s}(G)$ and $W^{k,s}_0(G), 1 \le s \le +\infty, k \in \mathbb{N}$. The dual of $W^{k,s}_0(G)$ will be denoted by $W^{-k,s'}(G)$, where $s' = \frac{s}{s-1}, 1 < s < +\infty$. For a general space of vector fields X the subspace of solenoidal fields will be denoted by X_σ. In particular, the space of solenoidal smooth fields with compact support is denoted by $C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. In addition we define energy space

$$V^2(G \times (0,T)) = L^\infty(0,T; L^2(G)) \cap L^2(0,T; W^{1,2}(G)), \quad 0 < T \le +\infty.$$

We now recall the definition of the local pressure projection $E^*_G : W^{-1,s}(G) \to W^{-1,s}(G)$ for a given bounded C^2-domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, introduced in [12] based on the unique solvability of the steady Stokes system (cf. [3]). More precisely, for any $F \in W^{-1,s}(G)$ there exists a unique pair $(v,p) \in W^{1,s}_{0,\sigma}(G) \times L^s_0(G)$ which solves weakly the steady Stokes system

$$\begin{cases} \nabla \cdot v = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad G, \quad -\Delta v + \nabla p = F \quad \text{in} \quad G, \\ v = 0 \text{ on} \quad \partial G. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Here $W^{1,s}_{0,\sigma}(G)$ stands for closure of $C^\infty_{c,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with respect to the norm in $W^{1,s}(G)$, while $L^s_0(G)$ denotes the subspace of $L^s(G)$ with vanishing average. Then we set $E^*_G(F) := \nabla p$, where ∇p denotes the gradient function in $W^{-1,s}(G)$ defined as

$$\langle \nabla p, \varphi \rangle = -\int_G p \nabla \cdot \varphi dx, \quad \varphi \in W^{1,s'}_0(G).$$

Remark 1.1. From the existence and uniqueness of weak solutions (v,p) to (1.6) for given for any $F \in W^{-1,s}(G)$ it follows that

$$\|\nabla v\|_{s,G} + \|p\|_{s,G} \le c\|F\|_{-1,s,G}. \tag{1.7}$$

where $c =$ const depending on s and the geometric properties of G, and depends only on s if G equals a ball or an annulus which due to the scaling properties of the Stokes equation. In case F is given by $\nabla \cdot f$ for $f \in L^s(\mathbb{R}^3)^9$ then (1.7) gives

$$\|p\|_{s,G} \le c\|f\|_{s,G}. \tag{1.8}$$

According to the estimate $\|\nabla p\|_{-1,s,G} \le \|p\|_{s,G}$, and using (1.8), we see that the operator E^*_G is bounded in $W^{-1,s}(G)$. Furthermore, as $E^*_G(\nabla p) = \nabla p$ for all $p \in L^s_0(G)$ we see that E^*_G defines a projection.

2. In case $F \in L^s(G)$, using the canonical embedding $L^s(G) \hookrightarrow W^{-1,s}(G)$, by the aid of elliptic regularity we get $E^*_G(F) = \nabla p \in L^s(G)$ together with the estimate

$$\|\nabla p\|_{s,G} \le c\|F\|_{s,G}, \tag{1.9}$$

where the constant in (1.9) depends only on s and G. In case G equals a ball or an annulus this constant depends only on s (cf. [3] for more details). Accordingly the restriction of E^*_G to the Lebesgue space $L^s(G)$ appears to be a projection in $L^s(G)$. This projection will be denoted still by E^*_G.

Definition 1.2 (Local Leray solution with projected pressure)**.** Let $u_0 \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. A vector function $u \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,+\infty))$ is called a *local Leray solution to* (1.1)–(1.3) *with projected pressure*, if for any bounded C^2 domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $0 < T < +\infty$

1. $u \in V^2_\sigma(G \times (0,T)) \cap C_w([0,T]; L^2(G))$.
2. u is a distributional solution to (1.2) , i. e. for every $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(Q)$ with $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$

$$\iint\limits_Q -u \cdot \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} - u \otimes u : \nabla\varphi + \nabla u : \nabla\varphi dxdt = 0. \tag{1.10}$$

3. $u(t) \to u_0$ in $L^2(G)$ as $t \to 0^+$.
4. The following local energy inequality with projected pressure holds for every nonnegative $\phi \in C^\infty_c(G \times (0,+\infty))$, and for almost every $t \in (0,+\infty)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int\limits_G |v_G(t)|^2\phi dx + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_G |\nabla v_G|^2\phi dxds \\
&\quad\le \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_G |v_G|^2\Big(\Delta + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)\phi + |v_G|^2 u\cdot\nabla\phi)dxds \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_G (u \otimes v_G) : \nabla^2 p_{h,G}\phi dxdt + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_G p_{1,G} v_G \cdot \nabla\phi dxds \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_G p_{2,G} v_G \cdot \nabla\phi dxds,
\end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

where $v_G = u + \nabla p_{h,G}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla p_{h,G} = -E^*_G(u), \\
&\nabla p_{1,G} = -E^*_G((u\cdot\nabla)u), \quad \nabla p_{2,G} = E^*_G(\Delta u).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.3. 1. Note that due to $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ the pressure $p_{h,G}$ is harmonic, and thus smooth in x. Furthermore, as it has been proved in [12] the pressure gradient $\nabla p_{h,G}$ is continuous in $G \times [0,+\infty)$.

2. The notion of local suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations satisfying the local energy inequality (1.11) has been introduced in [11]. As it has been shown there such solutions enjoy the same partial regularity properties as the usual suitable weak solutions in the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg theorem.

Our main result is the following

Theorem 1.4. *For any λ-DSS initial data $u_0 \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ there exists at least one local Leray solution with projected pressure $u \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,+\infty))$ to the Navier-Stokes equations* (1.1)–(1.3) *in the sense of Definition 1.2, which is discretely self-similar.*

2 Solutions of the linearized problem with initial velocity in $L^2_{\lambda-DSS}$

Let $1 < \lambda < +\infty$ be fixed. For $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ we denote $f_\lambda(x) := \lambda f(\lambda x), x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. For a time dependent function $f : Q \to \mathbb{R}^3$ we denote $f_\lambda(x,t) := \lambda f(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t), (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times (0,+\infty)$. We now define for $1 \le s \le +\infty$

$$L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(\mathbb{R}^3) := \Big\{ u \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3) \,\Big|\, u \in L^s(B_\lambda \setminus B_1), u_\lambda = u \ \text{ a. e. in } \mathbb{R}^3 \Big\},$$
$$L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(Q) := \Big\{ u \in L^1_{loc}(Q) \,\Big|\, u \in L^s(Q_\lambda \setminus Q_1), u_\lambda = u \ \text{ a. e. in } Q \Big\}.$$

Here B_r stands usual ball in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with center 0 and radius $r > 0$, while $Q_r = B_r \times (0, r^2)$.

In the present section we consider the following linearized problem in Q

$$\nabla \cdot u = 0, \tag{2.1}$$
$$\partial_t u + (b \cdot \nabla) u - \Delta u = -\nabla \pi \tag{2.2}$$

with the initial condition

$$u = u_0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}, \tag{2.3}$$

where u_0 belongs to $L^2_{\lambda-DSS}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\nabla \cdot u_0 = 0$, and $b \in L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)$, $3 \le s \le 5$ with $\nabla \cdot b = 0$ both in the sense of distributions. We give the following notion of a local solution with projected pressure for the linear system (2.1), (2.2).

Definition 2.1 (Local solution with projected pressure to the linearized problem)**.** Let $u_0 \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and let $b \in L^3_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,+\infty))$. A vector function $u \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,+\infty))$ is called a *local solution to* (2.1)–(2.3) *with projected pressure*, if for any bounded C^2 domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ and $0 < T < +\infty$ the following conditions are satisfied

1. $u \in V^2(G \times (0,T)) \cap C_w([0,T]; L^2(G))$.
2. u is a distributional solution to (2.2) , i. e. for every $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(Q)$ with $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$

$$\iint\limits_Q -u \cdot \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} - b \otimes u : \nabla \varphi + \nabla u : \nabla \varphi dx dt = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

3. $u(t) \to u_0$ in $L^2(G)$ as $t \to 0^+$.

4. the following local energy inequality with projected pressure holds for every non-negative $\phi \in C_c^\infty(G \times (0, +\infty))$, and for almost every $t \in (0, +\infty)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int_G |v_G(t)|^2\phi dx + \int_0^t\int_G |\nabla v_G|^2\phi dxds \\
&\quad\le \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_G |v_G|^2\Big(\Delta + \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Big)\phi + |v_G|^2 b\cdot\nabla\phi)dxds \\
&\qquad + \int_0^t\int_G (b\otimes v_G) : \nabla^2 p_{h,G}\phi dxdt + \int_0^t\int_G p_{1,G}v_G\cdot\nabla\phi dxds \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_0^t\int_G p_{2,G}v_G\cdot\nabla\phi dxds
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where $v_G = u + \nabla p_{h,G}$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla p_{h,G} = -E_G^*(u), \\
&\nabla p_{1,G} = -E_G^*((b\cdot\nabla)u), \quad \nabla p_{2,G} = E_G^*(\Delta u).
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Let $b \in L^3_{\lambda-DSS}(Q) \cap L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))$, $0 < T < +\infty$, with $\nabla\cdot b = 0$ in the sense of distributions. Suppose that $b \in L^3_{loc}(0,\infty;L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3))$. For every $u_0 \in L^2_{\lambda-DSS}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\nabla\cdot u_0 = 0$ in the sense of distributions, there exists a unique local solution with projected pressure $u \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3\times[0,+\infty))$ to (2.1)–(2.3) according to Definition 2.1 such that for any $0 < \rho < +\infty$ and $0 < T < +\infty$ it holds*

$$u \in L^3_{\lambda-DSS}(Q), \tag{2.6}$$

$$u \in C([0,T];L^2(B_\rho)), \tag{2.7}$$

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_{\rho^{\frac{1}{4}}}))} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{\rho^{\frac{3}{5}}}\times(0,T))} \le C_0K_0\Big(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} + |||b|||^3\max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big), \tag{2.8}$$

$$\|u\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(B_1))} \le C_0K_0\Big(1 + |||b|||^3\max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big), \tag{2.9}$$

where $K_0 := \|u_0\|_{L^2(B_1)}$ and $|||b||| = \|b\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))}$, while $C_0 > 0$ denotes a constant depending on λ only.

Before turning to the proof of Theorem 2.1, we show the existence and uniqueness of weak solutions to the linear system (2.1)– (2.3) for L^2_σ initial data.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $b \in L^3_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)\cap L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))$, $0 < T < +\infty$ with $\nabla\cdot b = 0$ in the sense of distributions. Suppose that $b \in L^3_{loc}(0,\infty;L^\infty(B_1))$. For every $u_0 \in L^2_\sigma(\mathbb{R}^3)$*

there exists a unique weak solution $u \in V^2_\sigma(Q) \cap C([0,+\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ *to* (2.1)–(2.3), *which satisfies the global energy equality for all* $t \in [0,+\infty)$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 dxds = \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|_2^2. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof: *1. Existence*: By using standard linear theory of parabolic systems we easily get the existence of a weak solution $u \in V^2(Q) \cap C_w([0,+\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ to (2.1)–(2.3) which satisfies the global energy inequality for almost all $t \in (0,+\infty)$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 dxds \le \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|_2^2. \tag{2.11}$$

It is well known that such solutions have the property

$$u(t) \to u_0 \quad in \quad L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad as \quad t \to 0^+. \tag{2.12}$$

On the other hand, from the assumption of the Lemma it follows that for all $t_0 \in (0,T)$

$$\|bu\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (t_0,T))} \le \|b\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (t_0,T))} \|u_0\|_2.$$

Accordingly, $u \in C((0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$ and for all $t_0 \in (0,T]$ and $t \in [t_0,T]$ the following energy equality holds true

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u|^2 dxds = \frac{1}{2}\|u(t_0)\|_2^2. \tag{2.13}$$

Now letting $t_0 \to 0$ in (2.13), and observing (2.12), we are led to (2.10).

By a similar argument, making use of (2.12) we easily prove the local energy inequality (2.5).

2. Uniqueness: Let $v \in V^2_\sigma(Q)$ be a second solution to (2.1)–(2.3) satisfying the global energy equality. As we have seen above this solution belongs to $C([0,+\infty); L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))$. Setting $w = u - v$, by our assumption on b it follows that $b \otimes w \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3 \times (t_0,T])$ for any $t_0 \in (0,T]$. Accordingly, as above we get the following energy equality

$$\frac{1}{2}\|w(t)\|_2^2 + \int_{t_0}^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla w|^2 dxds = \frac{1}{2}\|w(t_0)\|_2^2. \tag{2.14}$$

Verifying that $w(t_0) \to 0$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as $t_0 \to 0^+$ from (2.14) letting $t_0 \to 0^+$ it follows that $\|w(t)\|_2 = 0$ for all $t \in [0,T]$. This completes the proof of the uniqueness. ∎

Proof of Theorem 2.2: Since u_0 is λ-DSS we have $\lambda u_0(\lambda x) = u_0(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. We define the extended annulus $\tilde{A}_k = B_{\lambda^k} \setminus B_{\lambda^{k-3}}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, $B_1 \cup (\cup_{k=1}^\infty \tilde{A}_k) = \mathbb{R}^3$. There exists a partition of unity $\{\psi_k\}$ such that $\operatorname{supp} \psi_k \subset \tilde{A}_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\operatorname{supp} \psi_0 \subset$

B_1, and $0 \le \psi_k \le 1$, $|\nabla^2 \psi_k| + |\nabla \psi_k|^2 \le \lambda^{-2k}$, $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. We set $u_{0,k} = \mathbb{P}(u_0 \psi_k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Clearly,

$$u_0 = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_{0,k}, \tag{2.15}$$

where the limit in (2.15) is taken in the sense of $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be fixed. Thanks to Lemma 2.3 we get a unique weak solution $u_k \in V^2_\sigma(Q)$ to the problem

$$\nabla \cdot u_k = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad Q, \tag{2.16}$$

$$\partial_t u_k + (b \cdot \nabla) u_k - \Delta u_k = -\nabla \pi_k \quad \text{in} \quad Q, \tag{2.17}$$

$$u_k = u_{0,k} \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}, \tag{2.18}$$

satisfying the following global energy equality for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|u_k(t)\|_2^2 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx ds = \frac{1}{2}\|u_{0,k}\|_2^2. \tag{2.19}$$

By using the transformation formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{0,k}\|_2^2 &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} |u_0 \psi_k|^2 dx \le \int_{\tilde{A}_k} |u_0|^2 dx = \lambda^{3k} \int_{\tilde{A}_1} |u_0(\lambda^k x)|^2 dx \\ &= \lambda^k \int_{\tilde{A}_1} |\lambda^k u_0(\lambda^k x)|^2 dx = \lambda^k \int_{\tilde{A}_1} |u_0(x)|^2 dx \le c K_0^2 \lambda^k. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Combining (2.19) and (2.20), we are led to

$$\|u_k\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \|\nabla u_k\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2)} \le c K_0^2 \lambda^k. \tag{2.21}$$

Next, let $\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}k} \le r < \rho \le \lambda^{\frac{3}{5}(k+1)}$ be arbitrarily chosen, but fixed. By introducing the local pressure we have

$$\frac{\partial v_{k,\rho}}{\partial t} + (b \cdot \nabla) u_k - \Delta v_{k,\rho} = -\nabla p_{1,k,\rho} - \nabla p_{2,k,\rho},$$

where $v_{k,\rho} = u_k + \nabla p_{h,k,\rho}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla p_{h,k,\rho} = -E^*_{B_\rho}(u_k), \\ &\nabla p_{1,k,\rho} = -E^*_{B_\rho}((b \cdot \nabla) u_k), \quad \nabla p_{2,k,\rho} = E^*_{B_\rho}(\Delta u_k). \end{aligned}$$

The following local energy equality holds true for all $\phi \in C_{\rm c}^\infty(B_\rho)$ and for all $t \in [0,T]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int\limits_{B_\rho} |v_{k,\rho}(t)|^2\phi^6 dx + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{B_\rho} |\nabla v_{k,\rho}|^2\phi^6 dxds \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{B_\rho} |v_{k,\rho}|^2\Delta\phi^6 dxds + \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{B_\rho} |v_{k,\rho}|^2 b\cdot\nabla\phi^6 dxds \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{B_\rho} (b\otimes v_{k,\rho}) : \nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}\phi^6 dxds + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{B_\rho} p_{1,k,\rho} v_{k,\rho}\cdot\nabla\phi^6 dxds \\
&\qquad + \int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{B_\rho} p_{2,k,\rho} v_{k,\rho}\cdot\nabla\phi^6 dxds + \frac{1}{2}\int\limits_{B_\rho} |v_{0,k}|^2\phi^6 dx \\
&= I + II + III + IV + V + VI. \qquad (2.22)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\phi \in C_{\rm c}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ denote a cut off function such that $0 \le \phi \le 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $\phi \equiv 1$ on B_r, $\phi \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_\rho$, and $|\nabla^2\phi| + |\nabla\phi|^2 \le c(\rho - r)^{-2}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be chosen so that $\lambda^{m-1} \le \rho < \lambda^m$. Then we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|b\|^3_{L^3(B_\rho\times(0,T))} &= \lambda^{5m}\int\limits_0^{T\lambda^{-2m}}\int\limits_{B_{\rho\lambda^{-m}}} |b(\lambda^{-m}x, \lambda^{-2m}t)|^3 dxdt \\
&= \lambda^{2m}\int\limits_0^{T\lambda^{-2m}}\int\limits_{B_{\rho\lambda^{-m}}} |b(x,t)|^3 dxdt \\
&\le c\lambda^{2m-\frac{1}{3}m} T^{\frac{1}{6}} \|b\|^3_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))} \le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^3 \rho^{\frac{5}{3}} T^{\frac{1}{6}},
\end{aligned}$$

where and hereafter the constants appearing in the estimates may depend on λ. The above estimate together with $\rho^{\frac{5}{3}} \le \lambda^{k+1}$ yields

$$\|b\|_{L^3(B_\rho\times(0,T))} \le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|\lambda^{\frac{1}{3}k} T^{\frac{1}{18}}. \qquad (2.23)$$

In what follows we extensively make use of the estimate for almost all $t \in (0,T)$

$$\|\nabla p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \lesssim \|u_k(t)\|_{L^2(B_\rho)}, \qquad (2.24)$$

which is an immediate consequence of (1.9). In addition, we easily verify the inequality

$$\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \lesssim \|\nabla u_k(t)\|_{L^2(B_\rho)}. \qquad (2.25)$$

Indeed, observing that

$$\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}(t) = \nabla(\nabla p_{h,k,\rho}(t) - u(t)_{B_\rho}) = -\nabla E^*_{B_\rho}(u_k(t) - u_k(t)_{B_\rho})$$

by means of elliptic regularity along with the Poincaré inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} &\le c\rho^{-2}\|u_k(t)-u_k(t)_{B_\rho}\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)} + c\|\nabla u_k(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)}\\ &\le c\|\nabla u_k(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)}.\end{aligned}$$

Whence, (2.25).

(i) With the help of (2.21) we easily deduce that

$$I \le c(\rho-r)^{-2}\int_0^t\int_{B_\rho}|u_k|^2dxds \le cK_0^2(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^k T.$$

(ii) Next, using Hölder's inequality and Young's inequality together with (2.21), (2.23), (2.24) and (2.25), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}II &\le (\rho-r)^{-1}\int_0^t\int_{B_\rho}|b||v_{k,\rho}|^2\phi^5dxds\\
&\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}T^{\frac16}\|b\|_{L^3(B_\rho\times(0,T))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^2\|_{L^2(0,T;L^6)}\\
&\le c(\rho-r)^{-2}T^{\frac23}\|b\|_{L^3(B_\rho\times(0,T))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\qquad + c(\rho-r)^{-1}T^{\frac16}\|b\|_{L^3(B_\rho\times(0,T))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|\nabla v_{k,\rho}\phi^2\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|K_0(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^{\frac56k}T^{\frac{13}{18}}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\qquad + c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|(\rho-r)^{-1}\lambda^{\frac13k}T^{\frac29}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|\nabla v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^{\frac23}_{L^2(0,T;L^2)}\|\nabla v_{k,\rho}\|^{\frac13}_{L^2(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\\
&\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|K_0(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^{\frac56k}T^{\frac{13}{18}}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\qquad + c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|K_0^{\frac13}(\rho-r)^{-1}\lambda^{\frac12k}T^{\frac29}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|\nabla v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^{\frac23}_{L^2(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^2K_0^2(\rho-r)^{-4}\lambda^{\frac53k}T^{\frac{13}{9}}\\
&\qquad + c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6K_0^2(\rho-r)^{-6}\lambda^{3k}T^{\frac43} + \frac18\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \frac14\|\nabla v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\le cK_0^2(\rho-r)^{-3}\lambda^k\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\} + c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6K_0^2(\rho-r)^{-6}\lambda^{3k}\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\}\\
&\qquad + \frac18\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \frac14\|\nabla v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

(iii) In what follows we make use the following estimates using the fact that $p_{h,k,\rho}$ is harmonic. By using the identity

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}|\nabla h|^2\phi^2dx = \frac12\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}h^2\Delta\phi^2dx$$

for any harmonic function h on B_ρ, and cut off function $\phi\in C_c^\infty(B_\rho)$, we get

$$\|\nabla^3 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\phi^3\|_2 \le c(\rho-r)^{-1}\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\phi^2\|_2 \le (\rho-r)^{-2}\|\nabla p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|_{2,B_\rho} \tag{2.26}$$

By the aid of Sobolev's inequality, together with (2.26), we get for almost every $t \in (0,T)$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\phi^3\|_6 &\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\phi^2\|_{2,B_\rho} + c\|\nabla^3 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\phi^3\|_2\\ &\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\phi^2\|_{2,B_\rho}\\ &\le c(\rho-r)^{-2}\|\nabla p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|_{2,B_\rho}\\ &\le c(\rho-r)^{-2}\|u_k(t)\|_{2,B_\rho}.\end{aligned}$$

Integrating both sides of the above estimate, and estimating the right-hand side of of the resultant inequality by (2.21), we arrive at

$$\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^2(0,T;L^6)} \le c(\rho-r)^{-2}T^{\frac12}K_0\lambda^{\frac12 k}. \tag{2.27}$$

Arguing as above, and using (2.27), we find

$$\begin{aligned}III &\le cT^{\frac16}\|b\|_{L^3(0,TL^3(B_\rho)}\|v_k\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^2(0,T;L^6)}\\ &\le cK_0(\rho-r)^{-2}T^{\frac23}\lambda^{\frac12 k}\|b\|_{L^3(0,TL^3(B_\rho)}\|v_k\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\ &\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|K_0(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^{\frac12 k}T^{\frac{13}{18}}\|v_k\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\ &\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^2K_0^2(\rho-r)^{-4}\lambda^k T^{\frac{13}{9}} + \frac18\|v_k\phi^3\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}.\end{aligned}$$

(iv) We now going to estimate IV. Using (1.8), and arguing similar as before, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}IV &\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}\|p_{1,k,\rho}\|_{L^{\frac65}(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^6(0,t;L^2)}\\ &\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}T^{\frac16}\|bu_k\|_{L^{\frac65}(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\ &\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}T^{\frac16}\|b\|_{L^3(0,T;L^3(B_\rho))}\|u_k\|_{L^2(0,T;L^6(B_\rho))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\ &\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|(\rho-r)^{-1}\lambda^{\frac13 k}T^{\frac29}\|u_k\|_{L^2(0,T;L^6(B_\rho))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\ &\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|K_0(\rho-r)^{-1}\rho^{-1}\lambda^{\frac13 k}T^{\frac{13}{18}}\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\ &\quad + c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|(\rho-r)^{-1}\lambda^{\frac13 k}T^{\frac29}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|\nabla u_k\|^{\frac13}_{L^2(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\|\nabla u_k\|^{\frac23}_{L^2(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\\ &\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|K_0(\rho-r)^{-1}\lambda^{\frac{7}{30}k}T^{\frac{13}{18}}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\ &\quad + c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|K_0^{\frac13}(\rho-r)^{-1}\lambda^{\frac12 k}T^{\frac29}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\|\nabla u_k\|^{\frac23}_{L^2(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\\ &\le c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^2K_0^2(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^{\frac{7}{15}k}T^{\frac{13}{9}} + c|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6K_0^2(\rho-r)^{-6}\lambda^{3k}T^{\frac43}\\ &\quad + \frac18\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \frac14\|\nabla u_k\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\\ &\le (1+|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6)K_0^2(\rho-r)^{-6}\lambda^{\frac{17}{5}k}\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\}\\ &\qquad + \frac18\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)} + \frac14\|\nabla u_k\|^2_{L^2(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}.\end{aligned}$$

(v) Recalling the definition of $p_{2,k,\rho}$, using (1.8), (2.21) and Young's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V &\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}\|p_{2,k,\rho}\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\le c(\rho-r)^{-1}T^{\frac12}\Big(\int_0^T\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla u_k|^2dxdt\Big)^{\frac12}\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\le cK_0^2(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^kT+\frac18\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}\\
&\le cK_0^2(\rho-r)^{-6}\lambda^{\frac{17}{5}k}T+\frac18\|v_{k,\rho}\phi^3\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

(vi) It only remains to evaluate VI. Let $k\ge 9$. Then $\frac35(k+1)\le k-3$. Thus, $\mathrm{supp}(\psi_k)\cap B_\rho=\emptyset$. In particular, $\psi_k u_0=0$ in B_ρ. This shows that, almost everywhere in B_ρ it holds

$$u_{0,k}=\mathbb{P}(\psi_k u_0)-\psi_k u_0$$

which is a gradient field. Accordingly, almost everywhere in B_ρ

$$v_{0,k}=u_{0,k}-E^*_{B_\rho}(u_{0,k})=u_{0,k}-u_{0,k}=0.$$

Hence

$$VI=0.$$

For $k\le 8$ we find

$$VI\le\|u_{0,k}\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)}\le c\sum_{k=0}^8\|u_0\psi_k\|^2_{L^2}\le c\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(B_{\lambda^8})}\le cK_0^2.$$

We now insert the above estimates of $I,\dots,VI$ into the right-hand side of (2.23). This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in(0,T)}\int_{B_\rho}|v_{k,\rho}(t)|^2\phi^6dx+\int_0^T\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla v_{k,\rho}|^2\phi^6dxdt\\
&\qquad\le cK_0^2\max\{8-k,0\}+c(1+|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6)K_0^2\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\}(\rho-r)^{-6}\lambda^{\frac{17}{5}k}\\
&\qquad\qquad+\frac14\int_0^T\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla u_k|^2dxdt.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.28}$$

On the other hand, employing (2.26) and (2.21)

$$\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla^2p_{h,k,\rho}|^2\phi^6dxdt\le cK_0^2(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^kT,$$

we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_{B_r}|\nabla u_k|^2dxdt\\
&\qquad\le 2\int_0^T\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla v_{k,\rho}|^2\phi^6dxdt+2\int_0^T\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla^2 p_{h,k,\rho}|^2\phi^6dxdt\\
&\qquad\le 2\int_0^T\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla v_{k,\rho}|^2\phi^6dxdt+cK_0^2(\rho-r)^{-2}\lambda^kT \qquad (2.29)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.28) and (2.29), we are led to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_{B_r}|\nabla u_k|^2dxdt\\
&\qquad\le cK_0^2\max\{8-k,0\}+c(1+|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6)K_0^2\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\}(\rho-r)^{-6}\lambda^{\frac{17}{5}k}\\
&\qquad\quad+\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\int_{B_\rho}|\nabla u_k|^2dxdt. \qquad (2.30)
\end{aligned}$$

By virtue of a routine iteration argument from (2.30) we get for all $\rho\in[\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}k},2\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}k}]$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in(0,T)}\int_{B_{\rho/2}}|v_{k,\rho}(t)|^2dx+\int_0^T\int_{B_{\rho/2}}|\nabla u_k|^2dxdt\\
&\qquad\le cK_0^2\max\{8-k,0\}+c(1+|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6)K_0^2\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\}\rho^{-6}\lambda^{\frac{17}{5}k}\\
&\qquad\le cK_0^2\max\{8-k,0\}+c(1+|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6)K_0^2\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\}\lambda^{-\frac{1}{5}k}. \qquad (2.31)
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, by using the mean value property of harmonic functions along with (2.21), we estimate for almost all $t\in(0,T)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}k}})}&\le c\lambda^{\frac{3}{4}k}\|\nabla p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|^2_{L^\infty(B_{\rho/2})}\\
&\le c\lambda^{-\frac{21}{20}k}\|\nabla p_{h,k,\rho}(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_\rho)}\\
&\le c\lambda^{-\frac{21}{20}k}\|u_k\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_\rho))}\le cK_0^2\lambda^{-\frac{1}{20}k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (2.31), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{t\in(0,T)}\int_{B_{\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}k}}}|u_k(t)|^2dx+\int_0^T\int_{B_{\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}k}}}|\nabla u_k|^2dxdt\\
&\qquad\le cK_0^2\Big(1+|\!|\!|b|\!|\!|^6\max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}},T\}\Big)\lambda^{-\frac{1}{20}k}. \qquad (2.32)
\end{aligned}$$

Next, let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. Then (2.32) implies for all $k \geq l$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}l}}))} + \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}l}\times(0,T))} \\
&\qquad \leq \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}k}}))} + \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}k}\times(0,T))} \\
&\qquad \leq cK_0\Big(1 + \|\!|b|\!\|^3 \max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big)\lambda^{-\frac{1}{40}k}. \qquad (2.33)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by means of triangular inequality we find for each $N \in \mathbb{N}, N > l$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big\|\sum_{k=0}^N u_k\Big\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}l}}))} + \Big\|\sum_{k=0}^N \nabla u_k\Big\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}l}\times(0,T))} \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{R}^3))} + \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3\times(0,T))} \\
&\qquad + \sum_{k=l}^{N} \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{1}{4}l}}))} + \sum_{k=0}^{N} \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(B_{\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}l}\times(0,T))} \\
&\quad \leq cK_0\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}l} + cK_0\Big(1 + \|\!|b|\!\|^3 \max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big) \\
&\quad \leq cK_0\Big(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}l} + \|\!|b|\!\|^3 \max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $u^N = \sum_{k=0}^N u_k \to u$ in $V^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,T])$ as $N \to \infty$. It is readily seen that u is a weak solution to (1.1)–(1.3), and by virtue of the above estimate we see that for every $1 \leq \rho < \infty$

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_{\rho^{\frac{1}{4}}}))} + \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(B_{\rho^{\frac{3}{5}}\times(0,T))} \leq cK_0\Big(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|\!|b|\!\|^3 \max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big). \qquad (2.34)$$

In particular, in (2.34) taking $\rho = 1$, and using Sobolev's embedding theorem, we get

$$\|u\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(B_1))} + \|u\|_{V^2(B_1\times(0,T))} \leq C_0K_0\Big(1 + \|\!|b|\!\|^3 \max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big) \qquad (2.35)$$

with a constant $C_0 > 0$ depending only on λ.

It remains to show that $u_\lambda = u$. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $N \geq 4$. We set $w^N = u^N - u^N_\lambda$. Recalling that $b = b_\lambda$, it follows that w^N solves the system

$$\nabla \cdot w^N = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad Q_{\lambda^{-2}T}, \qquad (2.36)$$

$$\partial_t w^N + (b \cdot \nabla)w^N - \Delta w^N = -\nabla \pi^N \quad \text{in} \quad Q_{\lambda^{-2}T}, \qquad (2.37)$$

$$w^N = w^N_0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}, \qquad (2.38)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
w^N_0 &= \sum_{k=0}^N u_{0,k} - (u_{0,k})_\lambda = \sum_{k=0}^N \mathbb{P}(u_0\psi_k) - (\mathbb{P}(u_0\psi_k))_\lambda \\
&= u_0 \sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k - \Big(u_0 \sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k\Big)_\lambda + \nabla\mathcal{N} * (u_0 \cdot \nabla \sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k) - \Big(\nabla\mathcal{N} * (u_0 \cdot \nabla \sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k)\Big)_\lambda \\
&= u_0\Big(\sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k - \Big(\sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k\Big)(\lambda\cdot)\Big) + \nabla\mathcal{N} * (u_0 \cdot \nabla \sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k) - \Big(\nabla\mathcal{N} * (u_0 \cdot \nabla \sum_{k=0}^N \psi_k)\Big)_\lambda,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{4\pi|x|}$ stands for the Newton potential. For obtaining the third line in the above equalities we used the fact that $(u_0)_\lambda = u_0$. Owing to $\sum_{k=0}^{N} \psi_k = 1$ in $B_{\lambda^{N-3}}$ we have

$$\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{N} \psi_k - \Big(\sum_{k=0}^{N} \psi_k \Big)(\lambda \cdot) \Big) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_{\lambda^{N-4}}. \tag{2.39}$$

Let $\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}N} \leq r < \rho \leq \lambda^{\frac{3}{5}(N+1)}$ be arbitrarily chosen, but fixed. Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3)$ denote a cut off function such that $0 \leq \phi \leq 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $\phi \equiv 1$ on B_r, $\phi \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus B_\rho$, and $|\nabla^2 \phi| + |\nabla \phi|^2 \leq c(\rho - r)^{-2}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}(N+1)} \leq \lambda^{N-4}$. Thus, in view of (2.39) we infer that w_0^N is a gradient field in B_ρ, and therefore

$$w_0^N - E^*_{B_\rho}(w_0^N) = 0 \quad \text{a. e. in } B_\rho. \tag{2.40}$$

By a similar reasoning we have used to prove (2.30) we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\|w^N\|^2_{L^2(0,\lambda^{-2}T;L^6(B_r))} + \int_0^{\lambda^{-2}T} \int_{B_r} |\nabla w^N|^2 dxdt \\ &\leq cK_0^2(1 + \|\!|b|\!\|^6) \max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}}, T\}(\rho - r)^{-6} \lambda^{\frac{17}{5}N} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\lambda^{-2}T} \int_{B_\rho} |\nabla w^N|^2 dxdt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

Once more applying an iteration argument, together with the latter estimate, we deduce from (2.41)

$$\|w^N\|^2_{L^2(0,\lambda^{-2}T;L^6(B_{\lambda^{\frac{3}{5}}N}))} \leq cK_0^2(1 + \|\!|b|\!\|^6) \max\{T^{\frac{13}{9}}, T\} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{5}N}. \tag{2.42}$$

Accordingly, for all $0 < \rho < \infty$,

$$w^N \to 0 \quad in \quad L^2(0, \lambda^{-2}T; L^6(B_\rho)) \quad as \quad N \to +\infty.$$

On the other hand, observing that $w^N = u^N - (u^N)_\lambda \to u - u_\lambda$ in $L^2(0, \lambda^{-2}T; L^6(B_\rho))$ as $N \to \infty$, we conlude that $u = u_\lambda$. This completes the proof of the theorem. ∎

3 Proof of Theorem 1.4

We divide the proof in three steps. Firstly, given a λ-DSS function $b \in L^{\frac{18}{5}}_{loc}([0,\infty); L^3_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ we get the existence of a unique λ-DSS local solution with projected pressure u to the linearized system (2.1)–(2.3), replacing b by $R_\varepsilon b$ therein (cf. appendix for the notion of the mollification R_ε). Secondly, based on the first step we may construct a mapping $\mathcal{T} : M \to M$, which is continuous and compact. Application of Schauder's fixed point theorem gives a local suitable solution with projected pressure to the approximated Navier-Stokes equation. Thirdly, letting $\varepsilon \to 0^+$ in the weak formulation and in the

local energy inequality (2.5), we obtain the existence of the desired local Leray solution with projected pressure to (1.1)–(1.3).

We set

$$T := \min\Big\{\frac{1}{64C_0^6K_0^6}, \Big(\frac{1}{64C_0^6K_0^6}\Big)^{\frac{9}{13}}\Big\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Furthermore, set $X = L^3_{\lambda-DSS}(Q) \cap L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T; L^3_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ equipped with the norm

$$|\!|\!| v |\!|\!| := \|v\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))}, \quad v \in X.$$

Then we define,

$$M = \Big\{ b \in X \,\Big|\, |\!|\!| b |\!|\!| \le 2C_0K_0 \Big\}.$$

We now fix $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda - 1$. For $b \in M$ we set

$$b_\varepsilon := R_\varepsilon b,$$

where R_ε stands for the mollification operator defined in the appendix below. According to Theorem 2.2 there exists a unique λ-DSS solution $u \in X$ to (2.1)–(2.3) with b_ε in place of b. Observing (2.35), it follows that

$$\|u\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(B_1))} + \|u\|_{V^2(B_1\times(0,T))} \le C_0K_0\Big(1 + |\!|\!| b |\!|\!|^3 \max\{T^{\frac{13}{18}}, T^{\frac{1}{2}}\}\Big). \tag{3.2}$$

In view of (A.2) having $|\!|\!| b_\varepsilon |\!|\!|^3 \le \lambda^{\frac{5}{3}} |\!|\!| b |\!|\!|^3$, (3.2) together with (3.1) implies that

$$|\!|\!| u |\!|\!| \le 2C_0K_0,$$

and thus $u \in M$. By setting $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(b) := u$ defines a mapping $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon : M \to M$.

$\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$ is closed. In fact, let $\{b_k\}$ be a sequence in M such that $b_k \to b$ in X as $k \to \infty$, and let $u_k := \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(b_k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $u_k \to u$ in X as $k \to \infty$. From (3.2) it follows that $\{u_k\}$ is bounded in $V^2_\sigma(B_1 \times (0,T))$, and thus, eventually passing to a subsequence, we find that $u_k \to u$ weakly in $V^2_\sigma(B_1 \times (0,T))$ as $k \to \infty$. Since u_k solves (2.1)–(2.3) with $b_{k,\varepsilon} = R_\varepsilon b_k$ in place of b, from the above convergence properties we deduce that $u \in M \cap V^2_\sigma(B_1 \times (0,T))$ solves (2.1)–(2.3). Accordingly, $u = \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(b)$.

$\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(M)$ is relative compact in X. To see this, let $\{u_k = \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(b_k)\} \subset \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(M)$ be any sequence. Then $u_k \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,\infty))$ is a λ-DSS local suitable weak solution with projected pressure to

$$\nabla \cdot u_k = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad Q, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\partial_t u_k + (b_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla) u_k - \Delta u_k = -\nabla \pi_k \quad \text{in} \quad Q, \tag{3.4}$$

$$u_k = u_0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Introducing the local pressure, we have

$$\partial_t v_k + (b_{k,\varepsilon} \cdot \nabla) u_k - \Delta u_k = -\nabla \pi_{1,k} - \nabla \pi_{2,k} \quad \text{in} \quad B_2 \times (0,T), \tag{3.6}$$

where $v_k = u_k + \nabla p_{h,k}$, and

$$\nabla p_{h,k} = -E^*_{B_2}(u_k),$$
$$\nabla p_{1,k} = -E^*_{B_2}((b_{k,\varepsilon}\cdot\nabla)u_k), \quad \nabla p_{2,k} = E^*_{B_2}(\Delta u_k).$$

Thus, (3.4) implies that $v_k' = \nabla\cdot(-b_{k,\varepsilon}\otimes u_k + \nabla u_k - p_{1,k}I - p_{2,k}I)$ in $B_2\times(0,T)$. Since $b_k, u_k \in M$ we get the estimate

$$\| - b_{k,\varepsilon}\otimes u_k + \nabla u_k - p_{1,k}I - p_{2,k}I\|_{L^{\frac{9}{5}}(0,T;L^{\frac{3}{2}}(B_2))} \le c(1+C_0^2K_0^2).$$

Furthermore, by means of the reflexivity of $L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(B_2))$, and using Banach-Alaoglu's theorem we get a subsequence $\{u_{k_j}\}$ and a function $u\in M\cap V^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3\times[0,T])$ such that

$$u_{k_j}\to u \quad \textit{weakly in} \quad L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(B_2)),$$
$$u_{k_j}\to u \quad \textit{weakly}^* \textit{ in} \quad L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_2)) \quad \textit{as} \quad j\to\infty.$$

In particular, we have for almost every $t\in(0,T)$

$$u_{k_j}(t)\to u(t) \quad \textit{weakly in} \quad L^2(B_2) \quad \textit{as} \quad j\to\infty. \tag{3.7}$$

In addition, verifying that $\{v_{k_j}\}$ is bounded in $V^2(B_2\times(0,T))$, by Lions-Aubin's compactness lemma we see that

$$v_{k_j}\to v \quad \textit{in} \quad L^2(B_2\times(0,T)) \quad \textit{as} \quad j\to+\infty, \tag{3.8}$$

where $v = u+\nabla p_h$, and $\nabla p_h = -E^*(u)$. Now, let $t\in(0,T)$ be fixed such that (3.7) is satisfied. Then

$$\nabla p_{h,k_j}(t)\to\nabla p_h(t) \quad \textit{weakly in} \quad L^2(B_2) \quad \textit{as} \quad j\to\infty. \tag{3.9}$$

Since $p_{h,k}$ is harmonic in B_2, from (3.9) we deduce that

$$\nabla p_{h,k_j}(t)\to\nabla p_h(t) \quad \textit{a. e. in} \quad B_2 \quad \textit{as} \quad j\to\infty. \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, using the mean value property of harmonic functions, we see that $\{\nabla p_{h,k}\}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(B_1\times(0,T))$. Appealing to Lebesgue's theorem of dominated convergence, we infer from (3.10) that

$$\nabla p_{h,k_j}\to\nabla p_h \quad \textit{in} \quad L^2(B_1\times(0,T)) \quad \textit{as} \quad j\to\infty. \tag{3.11}$$

Now combining (3.8) and (3.11), we obtain $u_{k_j}\to u$ in $L^2(B_1\times(0,T))$. Recalling that $\{u_{k_j}\}$ is bounded in $V^2(B_1\times(0,T))$, we get the desired convergence property $u_{k_j}\to u$ in X as $j\to\infty$. To see this we argue as follows. Eventually passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $u_{k_j}\to u$ almost everywhere in $B_1\times(0,T)$. Let $\varepsilon>0$ be arbitrarily chosen. We denote $A_m = \{(x,t)\in B_1\times(0,T)\,|\,\exists\, j\ge m : |u_{k_j}(x,t)-u(x,t)|>\varepsilon\}$.

Clearly, $\cap_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m$ is a set of Lebesgue measure zero. Thus meas $A_m \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. We now get the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u_{k_j} - u\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))} = \\
&\le \|(u_{k_j} - u)\chi_{A_m}\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))} + \|(u_{k_j} - u)\chi_{A_m^c}\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))} \\
&\le \|u_{k_j} - u\|_{L^{\frac{168}{45}}(0,T;L^{\frac{28}{9}}(B_1))}\|\chi_{A_m}\|_{L^{\frac{504}{5}}(0,T;L^{84}(B_1))} + \|(u_{k_j} - u)\chi_{A_m^c}\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))}. \\
&\le c(\text{meas}\, A_m)^{\frac{5}{504}} + c\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\|\!|u_{k_j} - u|\!\| \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Applying Schauder's fixed point theorem, we get a function $u_\varepsilon \in M$ such that $u_\varepsilon = \mathcal{T}_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon)$. Thus, u_ε is a local suitable weak solution with projected pressure to

$$\nabla \cdot u_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad Q, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\partial_t u_\varepsilon + (R_\varepsilon u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla)u_\varepsilon - \Delta u_\varepsilon = -\nabla \pi_\varepsilon \quad \text{in} \quad Q, \tag{3.13}$$

$$u_\varepsilon = u_0 \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{0\}. \tag{3.14}$$

In particular, we have the a-priori estimate

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^4(0,T;L^3(B_1))} + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{V^2(B_1\times(0,T))} \le 2C_0K_0. \tag{3.15}$$

Let $\{\varepsilon_j\}$ be a sequence of positive numbers in $(0, \lambda - 1)$. Since u_ε is λ-DSS we have $u_\varepsilon(x,t) = u_{\varepsilon,\lambda}(x,t)$ for almost every $(x,t) \in Q$. Thus, there exists a set of measure zero $S \subset (0,+\infty)$ such that for all $t \in [0,+\infty) \setminus S$

$$u_{\varepsilon_j}(x,t) = u_{\varepsilon_j,\lambda}(x,t) = \lambda^k u_{\varepsilon_j}(\lambda^k x, \lambda^{2k} t) \quad \text{for a. e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \forall\, k \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall\, j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Clearly, $t \in (0,+\infty)\setminus S$ iff $\lambda^2 t \in (0,+\infty)\setminus S$. Indeed, let $t \in N^c$. Then $\lambda u_{\varepsilon_j}(\lambda x, t) = u_{\varepsilon_j}(\lambda^2 x, \lambda^2 t)$ for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. By means of the reflexivity we get a sequence $\varepsilon_j \to 0^+$ as $j \to \infty$ and $u \in V^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,T])$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&u_{\varepsilon_j} \to u \quad \textit{weakly in} \quad L^2(0,T;W^{1,2}(B_1)) \quad \textit{as} \quad j \to +\infty, \\
&u_{\varepsilon_j} \to u \quad \textit{weakly}^* \textit{ in} \quad L^\infty(0,T;L^2(B_1)) \quad \textit{as} \quad j \to +\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the proof the compactness of $\mathcal{T}_\varepsilon$, we infer

$$u_{\varepsilon_j} \to u \quad \textit{in} \quad L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1)) \quad \textit{as} \quad j \to 0^+.$$

Note that u is DSS, since u is obtained as a limit of sequence DSS functions.

Together with Lemma A.3 we see that

$$R_{\varepsilon_j} u_{\varepsilon_j} \to u \quad \textit{in} \quad L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1)) \quad \textit{as} \quad j \to 0^+. \tag{3.16}$$

This shows that $u \in L^2_{loc,\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3 \times [0,+\infty))$ is a local Leray solution with projected pressure to (1.1)–(1.3). ∎

Acknowledgements

Chae was partially supported by NRF grants 2016R1A2B3011647, while Wolf has been supported supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the project WO1988/1-1; 612414.

A Mollification for DSS functions

Let $1 < \lambda < +\infty$. Let $u \in L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Let $\rho \in C^\infty_c(B_1)$ denote the standard mollifying kernel such that $\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3} \rho dx = 1$. For $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda - 1$ we define

$$(R_\varepsilon u)(x,t) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{t}\varepsilon)^3} \int\limits_{B_{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}} u(x-y,t)\rho\Big(\frac{y}{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}\Big)dy, \quad (x,t) \in Q.$$

We have the following

Lemma A.1. *R_ε defines a bounded operator from $L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)$ into itself. Furthermore, for all $u \in L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)$ it holds for all $(x.t) \in Q$*

$$|(R_\varepsilon u)(x,t)| \le c\{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon\}^{-\frac{3}{s}} \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^s(B_{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}(x))} \tag{A.1}$$

with an constant $c > 0$ depending on s only.

Proof: Let $u \in L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)$. First we will verify that $R_\varepsilon u$ is λ-DSS. Indeed, using the transformation formula of the Lebesgue integral, we calculate for any $(x,t) \in Q$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(R_\varepsilon u)(\lambda x, \lambda^2 t) &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2(\sqrt{t}\varepsilon)^3} \int\limits_{B_{\lambda\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}} u(\lambda x - y, \lambda^2 t)\rho\Big(\frac{y}{\lambda\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}\Big)dy, \\
&= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{t}\varepsilon)^3} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3} \lambda u(\lambda(x-y), \lambda^2 t)\rho\Big(\frac{y}{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}\Big)dy \\
&= \frac{1}{(\sqrt{t}\varepsilon)^3} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x-y,t)\rho\Big(\frac{y}{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}\Big)dy = (R_\varepsilon u)(x,t).
\end{aligned}$$

Firstly, let $\lambda^{-2} < t \le 1$. Noting that $(R_\varepsilon u)(\cdot,t) = u(\cdot,t) * \rho_{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}$, where $\rho_{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}(y) = \frac{1}{(\sqrt{t}\varepsilon)^3}\rho\Big(\frac{y}{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}\Big)$, recalling that $\varepsilon < \lambda - 1$, by means of Young's inequality we find

$$\|(R_\varepsilon u)(\cdot,t)\|^s_{L^s(B_1)} \le \|u(\cdot,t)\|^s_{L^s(B_{1+\varepsilon})} \|\rho_{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}\|^s_{L^1} = \|u(\cdot,t)\|^s_{L^s(B_\lambda)}.$$

Integrating the above inequality over $(\lambda^{-2}, 1)$, and using a suitable change of coordinates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|R_\varepsilon u\|_{L^s(B_1\times(\lambda^{-2},1))} &\le \|u\|_{L^s(B_\lambda\times(\lambda^{-2},1))} \\
&= \|u\|_{L^s(B_1\times(\lambda^{-2},1))} + \|u\|_{L^s(B_\lambda\setminus B_1\times(\lambda^{-2},1))} \\
&= \|u\|_{L^s(B_1\times(\lambda^{-2},1))} + \lambda^{\frac{5-s}{s}} \|u\|_{L^s(B_1\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}}\times(\lambda^{-4},\lambda^{-2}))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Secondly, for $0 < t < \lambda^{-2}$ we estimate

$$\|(R_\varepsilon u)(\cdot,t)\|^s_{L^s(B_1\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}})} \le \|u(\cdot,t)\|^s_{L^s(B_\lambda\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}})} \|\rho_{\sqrt{t}\varepsilon}\|^s_{L^1} = \|u(\cdot,t)\|^s_{L^s(B_\lambda\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}})}.$$

Integration over $(0,\lambda^{-2})$ in time yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|R_\varepsilon u\|_{L^s(B_1\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}}\times(0,\lambda^{-2}))} &\le \|u\|_{L^s(B_\lambda\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}}\times(0,\lambda^{-2}))}\\ &= \|u\|_{L^s(B_1\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}}\times(0,\lambda^{-2}))} + \|u\|_{L^s(B_\lambda\setminus B_1\times(0,\lambda^{-2}))}\\ &= \|u\|_{L^s(B_1\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}}\times(0,\lambda^{-2}))} + \lambda^{\frac{5-s}{s}}\|u\|_{L^s(B_1\setminus B_{\lambda^{-1}}\times(0,\lambda^{-4})}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two estimates, we get

$$\|R_\varepsilon u\|_{L^s(Q_1\setminus Q_{\lambda^{-1}})} \le (1+\lambda^{\frac{5-s}{s}})\|u\|_{L^s(Q_1\setminus Q_{\lambda^{-1}})}.$$

This shows that $R_\varepsilon : L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(Q) \to L^s_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)$ is bounded.

The inequality (A.1) follows immediately from the definition of $R_\varepsilon u$ with the help of Hölder's inequality. ∎

Remark A.2. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma A.1, we get for any $u \in L^3_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)\cap L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))$, $0<T<1$

$$\|R_\varepsilon u\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))} \le \lambda^{\frac{5}{9}}\|u\|_{L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))}. \tag{A.2}$$

Lemma A.3. *Let $u \in L^3_{\lambda-DSS}(Q)\cap L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1))$, $0<T\le 1$. Then*

$$R_\varepsilon u \to u \quad in \quad L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_1)) \quad as \quad \varepsilon\to 0^+. \tag{A.3}$$

Proof: First by the absolutely continuity of the Lebesgue integral we see that for almost all $t\in(0,T)$

$$(R_\varepsilon u)(\cdot,t) \to u(\cdot,t) \quad in \quad L^3(B_1) \quad as \quad \varepsilon\to 0^+.$$

Let $A\subset(0,T)$ be any Lebesgue measurable set. By Young's inequality of convolutions we get for almost all $t\in(0,T)$

$$\int_A \|(R_\varepsilon u)(\cdot,t)\|^{\frac{18}{5}}_{L^3(B_1)}dt \le \int_A \|u(\cdot,t)\|^{\frac{18}{5}}_{L^3(B_\lambda)}dt$$

Since $u\in L^{\frac{18}{5}}(0,T;L^3(B_\lambda))$, the assertion (A.3) follows by the aid of Vitali's convergence lemma. ∎

B Weak trace for time dependent λ-DSS functions

Let $1<\lambda<+\infty$. A measurable function $u: Q\to\mathbb{R}^3$ is said to be λ-DSS, if for almost every $(x,t)\in Q$

$$u(x,t) = \lambda u(\lambda x,\lambda^2 t). \tag{B.1}$$

. We denote by $M(u)$ the set of all $t\in[0,+\infty)$ such that for all $k\in\mathbb{Z}$

$$u(x,t) = \lambda^k u(\lambda^k x,\lambda^{2k}t) \quad \text{for a. e.} \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^3. \tag{B.2}$$

.

Lemma B.1. *The set $[0,+\infty)\setminus M(u)$ is a set of Lebesgue measure zero.*

Proof: For $m\in N$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$ by $A_{m,k}$ we denote the set of all $t\in[0,+\infty)$ such that

$$\operatorname{meas}\left\{x\in\mathbb{R}^3\,\middle|\,u(x,t)=\lambda^k u(\lambda^k x,\lambda^{2k}t)\right\}\geq\frac{1}{m}.$$

Since u is discretely self-similar, we must have $\operatorname{meas}(A_{m,k})=0$. Since $M(u)\setminus[0,+\infty)=\cup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\cup_{m=1}^{\infty}A_{m,k}$ the assertion follows. ∎

Lemma B.2. *For every $t\in[0,+\infty)$ it holds $t\in M(u)$ iff $\lambda^2 t\in M(u)$.*

Proof: Let $t\in M(u)$. There exists a set $P\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ with $\operatorname{meas}(\mathbb{R}^3\setminus P)=0$ such that (B.2) holds for all $x\in P$. Define $P_k=\{y=\lambda^k x\,|\,x\in P\}$, $k\in\mathbb{Z}$. Cleary, $\operatorname{meas}(\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\cap_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}P_k)=0$. Let $x\in\cap_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}P_k$. Then $x,\lambda^{-1}x\in P$, and therefore for all $k\in\mathbb{Z}$ we get $u(\lambda^{-1}x,t)=\lambda u(x,\lambda^2 t)=\lambda^{k+1}u(\lambda^k x,\lambda^{2+2k}t)$, which is equivalent to

$$u(x,t)=\lambda^k u(\lambda^k x,\lambda^{2k}\lambda^2 t).$$

This shows that $\lambda^2 t\in M(u)$. Similarly, we get the opposite direction. ∎

As an immediate consequence of Lemma B.1 we see that

$$t\in M(u)\quad\Longleftrightarrow\quad\lambda^{2k}t\in M(u)\quad\forall\,k\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{B.3}$$

Let $\{v_j\}$ be a sequence in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$. We say

$$v_j\to v\quad\textit{weakly in}\quad L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)\quad\textit{as}\quad j\to+\infty$$

if for every $0<R<+\infty$

$$v_j\to v\quad\textit{weakly in}\quad L^2(B_R)\quad\textit{as}\quad j\to+\infty.$$

Lemma B.3. *Let $\{v_j\}$ be a sequence in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that for all $0<R<+\infty$*

$$\sup_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\|v_j\|_{L^2(B_R)}<+\infty. \tag{B.4}$$

Then there exists a subsequence $\{v_{j_m}\}$ and $v\in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$v_{j_m}\to v\quad\textit{weakly in}\quad L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)\quad\textit{as}\quad m\to+\infty.$$

Proof: By induction and the reflexivity of $L^2(B_m)$ we construct a sequence of subsequences $\{v_{j_k^{(m)}}\}\subset\{v_{j_k^{(m-1)}}\}$ and $\{v_{j_k^0}\}=\{v_j\}$ such that for some $v_m\in L^2(B_k)$ it holds

$$v_{j_k^{(m)}}\to v_m\quad\textit{in}\quad L^2(B_m)\quad\textit{as}\quad k\to+\infty$$

($m\in\mathbb{N}$). Clearly, $v_m|_{B_{m-1}}=v_{m-1}$. This allows us to define $v:\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}$ be setting $v=v_m$ on B_m. Then by Cantor's diagonalization principle the subsequence $v_{j_m}=v_{j_m^{(m)}}$ meets the requirements. ∎

We denote $\mathcal{V}=L^\infty_{loc}([0,+\infty);L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3))$ the space of all measurable functions $u:Q\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $u\in L^\infty(0,R^2,L^2(B_R))$ for all $0<R<+\infty$. By $\mathcal{V}_{\lambda-DSS}$ we denote the space of all λ-DSS functions $u\in\mathcal{V}$.

Lemma B.4. *Let $u \in \mathcal{V}_{\lambda-DSS}$. We assume that $\|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_R)} \le \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,R^2;L^2(B_R))}$ for all $t \in (0,R^2)$, $0 < R < +\infty$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for every $t \in M$*

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_R)} \le C \max\Big\{R\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1;L^2(B_1))}, \|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_{\sqrt{t}})}\Big\}. \tag{B.5}$$

Proof: Let $t \in M(u)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then by means of the transformation formula we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{A_k} |u(x,t)|^2 dx &= \lambda^{3k} \int\limits_{A_1} |u(\lambda^k x, t)|^2 dx = \lambda^k \int\limits_{A_1} |\lambda^k u(\lambda^k x, \lambda^{2k}\lambda^{-2k} t)|^2 dx \\ &= \lambda^k \int\limits_{A_1} |u(x, \lambda^{-2k} t)|^2 dx\end{aligned}$$

In case $\lambda^{2k} \ge t$ we get

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(A_k)} \le \lambda^k \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1;L^2(B_1))}.$$

On the contrary, if $\lambda^{2k} < t$ we find

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_{\lambda^k})} \le \|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_{\sqrt{t}})}.$$

Accordingly,

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_{\lambda^k})} \le c \max\Big\{\lambda^k \|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1;L^2(B_1))}, \|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_{\sqrt{t}})}\Big\}.$$

This yields (B.5). ∎

Lemma B.5. *Let $u \in \mathcal{V}_{\lambda-DSS}$. Furthermore, let $F_{ij}, g_i : Q \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $F_{ij}, g_i \in L^1(Q_R)$ and for all $0 < R < +\infty$, i, j=1,2,3. We suppose for all $t \in [0,+\infty)$ the function $u(\cdot,t) \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ with $\nabla \cdot u(\cdot,t) = 0$ in the sense of distributions, and that for all $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(Q)$ with $\nabla \cdot \varphi = 0$ the following identity holds true*

$$\int\limits_Q u \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} dx dt = \int\limits_Q F : \nabla\varphi + g \cdot \varphi dx dt. \tag{B.6}$$

Then, eventually redefining $u(t)$ for t in a set of measure zero, we have

$$u \in C_w([0,+\infty); L^2(B_R)) \quad \forall\, 0 < R < +\infty, \tag{B.7}$$

$$M(u) = [0,+\infty). \tag{B.8}$$

Proof: By $L(u) \subset [0,+\infty)$ we denote the set of all Lebesgue points of u, more precisely, we say $t \in L(u)$, if for every $0 < R < +\infty$

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int\limits_t^{t+\varepsilon} u(\cdot,\tau) d\tau \to u(\cdot,t) \quad \text{in} \quad L^2(B_R) \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to +\infty.$$

By Lebesgue's differentiation theorem we have meas$([0,+\infty)\setminus L(u))=0$. Let $t\in L(u)$. By a standard approximation argument we deduce from (B.6) that for every $\varphi\in C^\infty_{\rm c}(Q)$ with $\nabla\cdot u=0$

$$-\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}u(t)\varphi(t)dx+\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}u\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}dxds=\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}F:\nabla\varphi+g\cdot\varphi dxds. \tag{B.9}$$

Next, let $\{t_j\}$ be a sequence in $M(u)\cap L(u)$ such that $t_j\to t\in L(u)$ as $j\in+\infty$. Thank's to Lemma B.3 there exists a subsequence $\{t_{j_m}\}$ and $v\in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$u(t_{j_m})\to v\quad \textit{weakly in}\quad L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)\quad \textit{as}\quad m\to+\infty.$$

Thus, (B.9) implies for all $\varphi\in C^\infty_{\rm c}(Q)$ with $\nabla\cdot\varphi=0$

$$-\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}v\varphi(t)dx+\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}u\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}dxds=\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}F:\nabla\varphi+g\cdot\varphi dxds. \tag{B.10}$$

On the other hand, recalling that $t\in L(u)$, we have the same identity as (B.10) replacing v by $u(t)$ therein. This shows that for all $\psi\in C^\infty_{{\rm c},\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}(v-u(t))\cdot\psi dx=0.$$

Consequently, $v-u(t)$ is a harmonic function. On the other hand, by the lower semi continuity of the L^2 norm we obtain from (B.5) that

$$\|u(t)-v\|^2_{L^2(B_R)}\le C\max\Big\{R\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1;L^2(B_1))},\|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_{\sqrt{t}})}\Big\}. \tag{B.11}$$

Whence, $v=u(t)$. In particular, $u(s)\to u(t)$ weakly in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ as $s\in M(u)\cap L(u)\to t$.

Let $t\in[0,+\infty)$. There exists a sequence $\{t_j\}$ in $M(u)\cap L(u)$ such that $t_j\to t$ as $j\to+\infty$. Thank's to Lemma B.3 there exists a subsequence $\{t_{j_m}\}$ and $v\in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$u(t_{j_m})\to v\quad \textit{weakly in}\quad L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)\quad \textit{as}\quad m\to+\infty.$$

Observing (B.9) with t_{j_m} in place of t and letting $m\to+\infty$, we obtain for all $\varphi\in C^\infty_{\rm c}(Q)$ with $\nabla\cdot\varphi=0$

$$-\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}v\varphi(t)dx+\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}u\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}dxds=\int\limits_0^t\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^3}F:\nabla\varphi+g\cdot\varphi dxds. \tag{B.12}$$

On the other hand, by the lower semi continuity of the L^2 norm from (B.5) it follows that

$$\|v\|^2_{L^2(B_R)}\le C\max\Big\{R\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1;L^2(B_1))},\|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_{\sqrt{t}})}\Big\}. \tag{B.13}$$

For a second subsequence $\{t'_{j_m}\}$ with limit $w \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ we derive the same property as v which leads to the fact that for all $\psi \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{c},\sigma}(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (v - w) \cdot \psi dx = 0.$$

Consequently, $v - w$ is a harmonic function. Now taking into account the estimate (B.11), which is satisfied for w too, we infer $v = w$. Thus, the limit is uniquely determined. In case $t \notin M(u) \cap L(u)$ we set $u(t) = v$. In particular, by the lower semi continuity of the norm we have for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$ the estimate

$$\|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(B_R)} \le C \max\Big\{R\|u\|_{L^\infty(0,1;L^2(B_1))}, \|u(t)\|_{L^2(B_{\sqrt{t}})}\Big\}. \tag{B.14}$$

Furthermore, observing (B.10), it follows that for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$ and for all $\varphi \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(Q)$ with $\nabla\varphi = 0$

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(t)\varphi(t)dx + \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}dxds = \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F : \nabla\varphi + g \cdot \varphi dxds. \tag{B.15}$$

Next, let $t \in [0, +\infty)$, and let $\{t_j\}$ be any sequence in $[0, +\infty)$ with $t_j \to t$ as $j \to +\infty$. Once more applying Lemma B.3, we get a subsequence $\{t_{j_m}\}$ and $w \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$u(t_{j_m}) \to w \quad \textit{weakly in} \quad L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3) \quad \textit{as} \quad m \to +\infty.$$

Observing (B.15) with t_{j_m} in place of t and letting $m \to +\infty$, it follows that

$$-\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w\varphi(t)dx + \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial t}dxds = \int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} F : \nabla\varphi + g \cdot \varphi dxds. \tag{B.16}$$

Combining (B.16) and (B.15) and verifying (B.13) for w by a similar reasoning as above, we conclude $w = u(t)$. This shows that $u \in C_w([0, +\infty); L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3))$.

It only remains to prove that $M(u) = [0, +\infty)$. To see this let $\{t_j\}$ be a sequence in $M(u)$ such that $t_j \to t$. By using the transformation formula of the Lebesgue integral together with Lemma B.2 (cf. also (B.3)), we calculate for all $\psi \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{c}}(\mathbb{R}^3)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x,t)\psi(x)dx &= \lim_{j\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x,t_j)\psi(x)dx \\
&= \lambda^{-3k}\lim_{j\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(\lambda^{-k}x,t_j)\psi(\lambda x)dx \\
&= \lambda^{-2k}\lim_{j\to\infty}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x,\lambda^{2k}t_j)\psi(\lambda x)dx \\
&= \lambda^{-2k}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} u(x,\lambda^{2k}t)\psi(\lambda x)dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \lambda^k u(\lambda^k x,\lambda^{2k}t)\psi(x)dx.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields $u(x,t) = \lambda^k u(\lambda^k x, \lambda^{2k}t)$ for almost every $(x,t) \in Q$, and thus $t \in M(u)$. ∎

References

[1] Z. Bradshaw and T.-P. Tsai, *Forward discretely self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations II*, arXiv:1510.07504v1 (2015), to appear in Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN.

[2] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn, and L. Nirenberg, *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 35 (1982), pp. 771–831.

[3] G. Galdi, C. Simader, and H. Sohr, *On the stokes problem in lipschitz domains*, Annali di Mat. pura ed appl. (IV), 167 (1994), pp. 147–163.

[4] H. Jia and V. Šverák, *Local-in-space estimates near initial time for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations and forward self-similar solutions*, Invent. Math., 196 (2014), pp. 233–265.

[5] N. Kikuchi and G. A. Seregin, *Weak solutions to the cauchy problem for the Navier-Stokes equations satisfying the local energy inequality*, in Nonlinear equations and spectral theory, A. M. S. Transl., ed., no. 220 in Ser 2., Providence, RI, 2007, Amer. Math. Soc., pp. 141–164.

[6] H. Koch and D. Tataru, *Well-posedness for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Adv. Math., 157 (2001), pp. 22–35.

[7] P. G. Lemarié-Rieusset, *Recent developments in the Navier-Stokes problem*, vol. 431, Chapman Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.

[8] J. Leray, *Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace*, Acta Math., 63 (1934), pp. 193–284.

[9] V. Scheffer, *Partial regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations*, Pacific J. Math., 66 (1976), pp. 535–552.

[10] T.-P. Tsai, *Forward discretely self-similar solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Math. Phys., 328 (2014), pp. 29–44.

[11] J. Wolf, *On the local regularity of suitable weak solutions to the generalized navier-stokes equations*, Ann Univ Ferrara, 61 (2015), pp. 149–171.

[12] ——, *On the local pressure of the navier-stokes equations and related systems*, to appear in Adv. Diff. Equs., (2016).